Message

From: Whitcomb, Jill [jiwhitcomb@pa.gov]

Sent: 5/31/2019 2:43:24 PM

To: John J. Bell [jjbell@pfb.com]; Trentacoste, Emily [trentacoste.emily@epa.gov]; Baker, Jordan [c-jorbaker@pa.gov];

Baker, Jordan [jbaker@srbc.net]

CC: Goodlander, Douglas [dgoodlande@pa.gov]; Hostetter, Gregory [grhostette@pa.gov]; Royer, Matthew B

[mzr154@psu.edu]

Subject: [SPAM-Sender] RE: [External] Revised Draft of Ag Workgroup Recommended Benchmarks

John,

Jordan and I are meeting early next week to review what he ran for the enhanced nutrient management recommendations as provided by Matt Royer (Jordan received the copy with Matt's edits at the May workgroup meeting).

Additionally, Frank, Jordan, and the modelers are having a call next week to review what we would need to do to move forward with Precision Feeding reporting and identify the feasibility of working with the CBP on a "study" with Milk Urea Nitrogen as the basis for getting credit for Dairy Precision Feeding (much like what was done with the swine/poultry study so that states don't have to report Phytase, for instance).

Apologies for not providing that information to you all....this week has gotten away from me. But Jordan and I are coordinating so that it will be ready for the June 10 meeting.

Thanks, Jill

From: John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com> Sent: Friday, May 31, 2019 10:38 AM

To: Trentacoste, Emily <trentacoste.emily@epa.gov>; Baker, Jordan <c-jorbaker@pa.gov>; Baker, Jordan

<jbaker@srbc.net>

Cc: Goodlander, Douglas <dgoodlande@pa.gov>; Hostetter, Gregory <grhostette@pa.gov>; Royer, Matthew B

<mzr154@psu.edu>; Whitcomb, Jill <jiwhitcomb@pa.gov>

Subject: [External] Revised Draft of Ag Workgroup Recommended Benchmarks

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA SPAM@pa.gov.

Good morning, Emily and Jordan,

I'm not sure if you have received the draft revisions to the Ag Workgroup's recommended benchmarks for WIP-3. The draft attached to this email should be the version that Matt Royer has offered additional amendments. Matt's version includes revisions to the Workgroup's original recommendations for Enhanced Nutrient Management, specifically performance of timing, rate and application activities on manured and non-manured cropland.

We would need to have before the Workgroup's June 10 meeting a assessment of CAST's measured impacts that Matt's recommended practices would have in reducing nitrogen and phosphorus pollution, as well as estimated costs for implementing these practices.

I nanks in advance for your neip and effort.
Sent from Workspace ONE Boxer
Forwarded message
From: Royer, Matthew B < mzr154@psu.edu>
Date: May 17, 2019 at 8:47:38 AM EDT
Subject: RE: [External] RE: Hopefully a more polished first draft of revisions to Ag Workgroup report - THE REAL
DOCUMENT I INTENDED TO ATTACH TO MONDAY'S EMAIL
To: Goodlander, Douglas < <u>dgoodlande@pa.gov</u> >,John J. Bell < <u>jjbell@pfb.com</u> >,Hostetter, Gregory
 Ex. & Parsonal Privacy (PP) @ hotmail.com/" Ex. & Parsonal Privacy (PP) @ century link.net, james har bach@ hotmail.com/" @ cembar
qmail.com,jdrafarm@frontier.com,Brown, Karl <kbrown@pa.gov>,Jennifer Reed-Harry</kbrown@pa.gov>
<pre></pre> jrharry@pennag.com>,bchain@cbf.org,jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org,jshuler@farmerspride.com,chriss@teamag
inc.com,Whitcomb, Jill <jiwhitcomb@pa.gov></jiwhitcomb@pa.gov>

PFB Information Security Warning: This is an external email. Do not click on links or open attachments unless you trust the sender.

Hello all,

I am sorry to be missing today's meeting. Let me first start with a big thank you to John for the laboring oar in moving the revised draft revisions forward. I believe the draft very much captures our collective ideas shared at previous meetings, and also thoughtfully considers the primary ideas shared at the Feb PA in Balance meeting.

My comments on the draft are attached. John, I started working on these comments before receiving your follow up email sending a new draft, so these are made still on the old draft. Since the comments are not too extensive, I just kept them on the old draft. My comments are in the yellow highlighted text.

For the most part, my comments are minor but there are three major ones, one on the existing draft related to PACS, and two that recommend changes to our implementation goals for enhanced nutrient management (based on the information from the 4R Alliance) and to dairy precision feeding (based on new information from the Extension Dairy Team).

For the two recommended changes to our implementation goals, I'd like to provide a little more context for your consideration:

1. Enhanced Nutrient Management (4Rs):

Based on the survey results conducted by the 4R alliance in Swatara watershed, I would recommend us expanding our 4R goal to all cropland acres (including manured acres), and also increase some of our percentage goals for rate, placement and timing 4R practices for Nitrogen based on these results (see my attached memo and analysis for more details).

2. Dairy Precision Feeding:

Based on some preliminary data analysis just conducted by the Dairy Extension Team to help inform our Workgroup I recommend an increase from 33% to 70% for implementation of this practice.

For further consideration of whether our recommendations on precision feeding should be revised, I reached out to Ginny Ishler and her dairy team colleagues to see if any data existed to support changes to our precision feeding implementation recommendations. We have recommended precision feeding for 33% percent of cows as the WIP goal. Comments received at PA in Balance indicated that some felt this number was perhaps low and that the practice was already being implemented at higher rates at least for Nitrogen. This comment was shared by many in the industry and extension specialists.

To explore some factual support for this view, Ginny and Rob Goodling reached out to industry representatives and were able to obtain Milk Urea Nitrogen (MUN) records for PA dairy herds from Dairy Herd Information Association (DHIA). 11 years of data were obtained for Jan-Feb, and monthly data was obtained for the last 5 years. The Chesapeake Bay Program expert panel report on precision feeding indicates that MUN combined with manure testing data can validate whether precision feeding is being implemented. The acceptable range of MUN in support of precision feeding is 8-12 mg/dl. While we do not have corresponding manure analysis data (or other relevant data like dry matter intake) to accompany the MUN data, the MUN data can be a good general indicator of whether precision feeding to reduce N is being implemented.

The attached report is a result of the data analysis. Ginny and Rob did a very impressive job getting this data and analyzing it in a short period of time so we can consider it as part our workgroup recommendations.

In summary, what the results show is that over the last decade—and in particularly in the last five years—there is a trend toward lower MUN values. If the data is extrapolated, since 2014, 70% of herds were within the acceptable range of 8-12 mg/dl, with the average 11.19 mg/dl over the last five years.

These results paint a very different picture than existed a decade plus ago, when trends were reversed. The 2009 Expert Panel Report cites a 2002 study where 70% of dairy farmers in one major coop oversupplied protein to their herds and MUN averaged 12.5 mg/dl.

The data does seem to support an increase of precision feeding implementation that is beyond the current 33% recommendation of the Ag Workgroup. The DHIA data study compiled by Ginny and Rob would support an increase to 70%. If the trends they've observed in the data hold true, then meeting this goal becomes a verification and data collection issue mainly. I know that the Extension dairy team would be interested in helping to support such data collection by working with milk coops, as Ginny and Rob mention in their report. I would recommend we increase the Phase 3 WIP goal to 70% based on the attached summary report of the DHIA data analysis.

Thanks everyone, I look forward to hearing the results of the meeting and look forward to further engagement with you all to get us to the finish line of our work!

Best, Matt

Matt Royer
Director, Agriculture and Environment Center
Penn State University
College of Agricultural Sciences
111B Ferguson Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 863-8756
mroyer@psu.edu

From: Goodlander, Douglas < dgoodlande@pa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2019 4:05 PM

To: John J. Bell < jjbell@pfb.com >; Hostetter, Gregory < grhostette@pa.gov >; Royer, Matthew B < mzr154@psu.edu >; learned provided provi

Subject: RE: [External] RE: Hopefully a more polished first draft of revisions to Ag Workgroup report - THE REAL DOCUMENT I INTENDED TO ATTACH TO MONDAY'S EMAIL

John, thanks for all your hard work on getting this revised draft to this stage for our collective review.

Doug

Douglas Goodlander | Environmental Program Manager, Operations Division Department of Environmental Protection Bureau of Clean Water Rachel Carson State Office Building 400 Market Street | Harrisburg, PA 17101 P: 717.772.0141 | F: 717.772.4474 www.dep.pa.gov

From: John J. Bell <jjbell@pfb.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2019 10:04 AM

To: Goodlander, Douglas <dgoodlande@pa.gov>; Hostetter, Gregory <grhostette@pa.gov>; mzr154@psu.edu;

bloom bloom bloom bloom bloom; bloom bloom; blo

Subject: [External] RE: Hopefully a more polished first draft of revisions to Ag Workgroup report - THE REAL DOCUMENT INTENDED TO ATTACH TO MONDAY'S EMAIL

Importance: High

ATTENTION: This email message is from an external sender. Do not open links or attachments from unknown sources. To report suspicious email, forward the message as an attachment to CWOPA_SPAM@pa.gov.

Good morning, everyone,

It has been brought to my attention (since I did not discover it) that I attached the wrong document to the email I sent to you Monday, that was intended to forward to you the "more polished" rederaft of our Workgroup report. I am very sorry for the error. Attached is the document I intended to send to you Monday.

Again:

 Black language indicates language that has not been changed from the language contained in the preliminary report.

- Blue language indicates language changed from the preliminary report made in the draft version I sent to you Sunday.
- Green language indicates further edits and language changes made in the "more polished" draft version attached to this email.
- Red language represents editorial notes of potential need for further revision before the draft is finalized.

For those of you who are intending to attend tomorrow's meeting, I will bring hard copies of the draft, as shown in the attachment.

Sincerely,

John

John J. Bell

Senior, Government Affairs Counsel Government Affairs and Communications Division 717.731.3547



STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY This electronic mail transmission contains confidential information intended only for the person(s) named. Any use, distribution, copying or disclosure by another person is strictly prohibited.

From: John J. Bell

Sent: Monday, May 13, 2019 6:53 PM

To: dgoodlande@pa.gov; grhostette@pa.gov; mzr154@psu.edu; herowell and herosym @hotmail.com; elementurylink.net; jamesharbach@hotmail.com @embargmail.com; jdrafarm@frontier.com; kbrown@pa.gov;

<u>irharry@pennag.com</u>; <u>bchain@cbf.org</u>; <u>jeffhill@lancasterconservation.org</u>; <u>jshuler@farmerspride.com</u>; chriss@teamaginc.com; **Whitcomb**, Jill < jiwhitcomb@pa.gov>; **John J. Bell** < jjbell@pfb.com>

Subject: Hopefully a more polished first draft of revisions to Ag Workgroup report

Importance: High

Hello again, folks,

I had at least some opportunity today to do a more thorough proofread of the draft I forwarded to you yesterday. The areas marked in green font would represent changes to the version forwarded yesterday. Most of the green language were edits to what I had personally drafted, in response to grammatical errors, word omissions, and sentences whose thoughts were not very well communicated. I have also included in green font some suggested changes to areas drafted by other Workgroup members that I believe needed some further clarification or insight. Hopefully I have captured

what those drafters intended to say and accurately reflect our collective thoughts on the subjects addressed in the draft.

This is my last circulation of draft changes before Friday's meeting.

Please confirm by email reply your receipt of this draft version. Also, if you can, before Friday's meeting, share your initial thoughts, criticisms and suggestions for additional changes to others in the Workgroup (email addresses above).

Sincerely,

John

John J. Bell
Senior, Government Affairs Counsel
Government Affairs and Communications Division
717.731.3547



STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY This electronic mail transmission contains confidential information intended only for the person(s) named. Any use, distribution, copying or disclosure by another person is strictly prohibited.

From: John J. Bell

Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2019 5:01 PM

Subject: A Completed (But Not Polished) Draft of Revisions to Ag Workgroup Preliminary Report

Importance: High

Hi, folks,

Attached is the draft of revisions to the Workgroup's preliminary report that is the starting point for review, criticisms, recommendations and hopefully consensus by the Workgroup for presentation to the Steering Committee. Several persons besides myself were involved, with those engaged working independently to revise specific areas that they volunteered to do. To this point, the draft reflects a compilation of efforts made individually, and is not be viewed by you as representing any degree of collaboration or joint support or acceptance by or among the Co-Chairs. It's a draft, and those who did volunteer to draft changes to specific portions may be recommending substantial changes to other portions they were not involved with.

As with the first draft of the Workgroup's preliminary report that was circulated in June of last year, the revisions contained in the attached document try to incorporate and reflect the discussions and collective thoughts that were believed to have been reached by the Workgroup during meetings we've had after the release of our preliminary report. The language in blue should reflect that which has been added or modified from the preliminary report. To be honest, focus of the draft was to include additional recommendations or to make material modifications of recommendations that had surfaced in the course of more recent meetings. So, there was little real attention in reviewing existing language of other areas for which the Workgroup was not suggesting any real change at recent meetings. There may still need to be some edits for consistency with other portions of the draft.

I will again admit (like I did with last year's initial circulation of the preliminary report) that this draft hasn't been thoroughly proofread for errors. So there may well be some typos and grammatical errors and inconsistencies that will need to be cleaned up. Again, if you would focus more closely on the accuracy of thought being communicated rather than accuracy of grammar, that would be very helpful in getting the quality of feedback we need.

I'm also going to express sincere apologies for not getting this to you well before this. I realize we still have time to bring all the ideas that have surfaced at more recent meetings to the attention of the powers that be. But I also suggested this draft would be to you much sooner than today. And I am disappointed that you're not even given a full weekend prior to our upcoming meeting to peruse it.

A large portion of Friday's meeting will focus on the concepts and recommendations contained in this draft. But just to give us a clearer focus of areas to consider and to make Friday's meeting more, I would encourage you offer and share by email with other Workgroup members before Friday your thoughts and ideas on the additions and modifications drafted. The emails of all of the Workgroup members are provided above. Do they accurately reflect our discussion and collective thoughts? Do they make sense? Was anything significant left out? We can refine the language later, but it's more important that the draft accurately capture and reflect what we discussed at meetings and what we as a body thought should be part of our package of recommendations.

If anyone has any questions or concerns you want to raise with me or with other Workgroup members, please do so. I'm certainly readily available for contact, if you do. Many thanks to all of you for your continued effort and support.

Sincerely,

John

John J. Bell

Senior, Government Affairs Counsel Government Affairs and Communications Division 717.731.3547



STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY This electronic mail transmission contains confidential information intended only for the person(s) named. Any use, distribution, copying or disclosure by another person is strictly prohibited.